

Sobolevska M.O.

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Associate Professor, Doctor of Sociological Science

GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF "SOCIAL INTEGRATION" IN SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY: FROM CLASSICS TO MODERN

Abstract. *The article examines the conceptual and paradigmatic conditions of genesis and development of the concept "social integration" in the sociological theory. Author traces the history of formation the concept "social integration" from its classical definition in the structural functionalism of T. Parsons to Its modern rethinking in the conception of "system and life-world" of J.Habermas and the theory of structuration of A.Giddens.*

Keywords: *social integration, system integration, structural functionalism, the theory of structuration.*

Introduction. Questions, relating to description and understanding mechanisms of social order and social integration are among the key and significant for social science. During the existence of the sociology – from classics of science to modern theorists - not once their efforts directed at intellectual understanding of this subject. Therefore, the arsenal of modern social science accumulated a considerable number of answers that decorated in very complex theoretical constructions try to describe and explain the conditions opportunities for social order and mechanisms of social integration.

The history of sociological recourse to these issues acquired by a tradition and a number of concepts designed to describe and reflect most accurately examined processes. We can confidently say that modern theoretical sociology provides sufficiently developed and sophisticated conceptual apparatus to describe them. These concepts, relating to problems of integration and social order, which is firmly rooted in sociological dictionaries and encyclopedias, have different interpretations within different theoretical constructs and grows a variety of connotations. In this connection, the same concept, built into the intricate theoretical framework, claiming the status of an effective research tool, offers different (sometimes opposite) variants of the explaining of social processes and identifies claim to making diagnoses of modernity. Therefore, it is not only the definition of the concept, but in consideration of its specific conceptual field in which it emerged and formed, it is especially relevant requirement of modern sociological theorizing.

Therefore, **the purpose** of this article is to review and systematize definitions of "social integration" in connection with the specific conditions of its production both in classical and in modern sociological theories.

Let's start with the definition of paradigmatic features in which emerging and formed sociological discourse that considers the problem of social integration.

It should be noted that a number of concepts are developed by sociologists in connection with the description of integrative social processes, formed mostly within the functionalist tradition. This sets up a paradigmatic specific of theoretical perspectives and the concepts that developed within it, that considered when referring to them.

Thus, in the works of classics of sociology late XIX - early XX cent., concept of social integration was first in the Spenser's works, where social integration considered in the context of organismic analogies. In the conception of another famous author of classical functionalism - Durkheim - social integration are viewed in connection with social solidarity - mechanical and organic presented two types of societies: traditional and modern. Durkheim defines social integration as a two-way process: first, a sense of dependence from society that felt by the individual, and, secondly, as certain obligations of society towards to its members [1, p. 406-407]. Therefore, integration occurs as awareness necessary depending on one another - individuals from society to society from individuals.

This basic understanding of social integration supplemented and complicated with the advent of more abstract theoretical constructs in sociology who tried to follow the logic of not only directly observable social processes, but also the theoretical logic of social science.

Continuing the tradition of functionalist review and described the processes of social integration, T.Parsons (within structural functionalism) defines integration as a type connection of elements of the social system in which these items are "on the one hand to prevent the collapse of the system or its stability breach, on the other - cooperate for joint action of the system as a whole "[2, p. 72].

Thus, Parsons consider the social integration in a wider context and in connection with the problem of social order in a Hobbs manner: "The problem of order and thus the nature of stable integration of social interaction focuses on the integration of motivations of the actors and normative standards of culture that integrating actions between individuals by interpersonal system"[3, p. 12]. Thus, Parsons considered the problems of social integration in the context of the normative order, to which the classic of American sociology generally pays much more attention than the factual order.

The founder of structural functionalism seems integration as interpenetration between social and individual systems. It noted three sides of such relations, and, according to Parsons, the defining element, which mediates the relationship among the sides, becomes a cultural system: "The integration into society of its members implies the existence of zone of interpenetration between social and individual systems. However, these relationships has a three sides, mainly because of the cultural system, as well also as part of the social structure, internalized in the individual, but at the same time part of the cultural system must be institutionalized in society" [4, p. 20].

Already at this stage in the works of the classic of structural functionalism can be traced distinction between the two mechanisms of integration: integration as internalization (within relationship individual-society) and integration as

institutionalization (within consistency functioning social subsystems, whose task is legitimation of existing norms and values). In the future, this distinction has given reasons for the separation of the two types of integration - system and structural, which the British sociologist D. Lockwood made in the writings in 1964.

Lockwood marks the social integration as the relationship between actors and the system - as relations between parts of the social system: "If the problem of social integration focuses on the conflict or order of the interactions between the actors, the problem of system integration focuses on policy or conflict in the relationship between parts of the social system" [5, p. 245]. However, if the interpretation of the concept of system integration remains within the functionalist tradition (as relations of subsystems), then on the concept of social integration (in Parsons - integration of the individual in society) was shifting the focus of attention on the situation of interpersonal interaction, in fact - of social relations. On the one hand, this approach a little simplified the original Parsons theoretical constructs, on the other - reveals the opportunities to consider the same social phenomena from positions of different perspectives.

However, Lockwood not only distinguishes two types of integration, but also attempts to expand analytical capabilities of functionalist tradition by the theory of conflict. Lockwood criticizes the Parsons normative functionalism since the last neglect the possibilities to describe the tension, conflict or contradiction between the elements of the system and subsystems, so institutions describes as the embodiment of value systems shared by all members of society. At the same time distinguishing between system and social integration (albeit purely analytical) offers a more sensitive tool for diagnosing of social tensions and conflicts. Thus, according to Lockwood, the result of distinguishing of two types of integration is the opportunity to explain some situations when, for example, in society there is a set of contradictions and systemic problems, which are not manifested of the level of actors activity. On the contrary, society may have conflicts that do not lead to changes in its overall structure. Only the simultaneous consideration of problems of system and social integration allows, according to Lockwood, to develop a complete theory of society.

In any case, regardless of the specific author's interpretation and attempt to a combination of functionalist tradition of conflict approach, the distinction between social and system integration was an important step forward for sociological theory as possible to arrange and systematize the various aspects of social integration, laying thus the basis for further theoretical discussions. The tradition of distinction between system and of social integration actively developed by social theorists of the late twentieth century in that dual form.

Consequently, representatives of conflict theory tried to rethink and give a new interpretation of the key topics of T. Parsons sociology - the problem of social order and social integration. Critics of Parsons' approach from positions of the theory of conflict cast doubt on the authority of Parsons in resolving the problem of social integration, but they failed to establish itself as an independent theoretical school and present a real alternative to Parsons' teaching. The central question that

faced for the theoreticians of the last quarter of the twentieth century was the consideration of not only the role of government in situations of conflict in modern societies, but also consideration of the role of culture. So Parsons' strategy of theoretical synthesis became useful when searching for answers to mentioned questions. The desire of synthesis as an attempt to preserve and combining all that worked out by earlier approaches is a key instrument in the hands of sociologists to provide answers to the classic questions.

An example of combining traditions of phenomenological and neo-Marxist approaches within a rethinking of the concept of social integration, presented in structural functionalism of T. Parsons, was the theory of German researcher Habermas.

Habermas, continuing the tradition of distinction between social and system integration, based not only on the development of D. Lockwood, but finds the justification for this kind of differences, based on two types of social order selected by T. Parsons - normative and factual. Parsons examined the types of social order, depending on whether the implemented ordered interaction of individuals in connection with the general norms (normative order) or occur by accident - a set of actions (factual order - for example, order in the case of traffic congestion). However, when Parsons focuses on the normative order, Habermas proposes to consider each of them. Moreover, Habermas links this distinction of orders (and with it the types of integration) with distinction of "system" and "life-world". Therefore, the normative order of "life-world", according to Habermas, is the ordered interaction of individuals who take part in it, guided by general rules, consensus, culture, etc. [6, p. 223]. The mechanism of social integration, which then triggered, realized through underpinned by norms made of consensus in the communication process. Thus, to the normative order of "life-world", according to Habermas, corresponds the type of social integration.

"Systems" did not express the will of the participants of interaction, so the order is there because of unintended consequences of actions of many individuals. System integration, according to Habermas, achieved through the non-normative regulation of individual actions that go beyond the actor's consciousness. Moreover, system integration and coordination of actions carried out by such interaction, whose members acting mostly abstract and anonymous (for example, the buyer and the producer, which is usually, do not know each other personally). Unlike, for example, social integration within the "life-world", what differs in that, there actors directly facing each other in a particular situation, present physically, so can coordinate their actions with each other. That is why the level of social integration corresponds to the type of communicative action in Habermas terms, while the level of system integration - instrumental and strategic action.

However, the most interest from the Habermas perspective is not so much distinction between two types of order (the "system" and "life-world") and a substantiation of on the basis of two types of integration (system and social), but in the study of processes of their interaction. Here theoretician moving from design the conceptual tools to the analysis of the modern world, the result of which is making the diagnosis of modern society, known as the "colonization of the life

world”: “so did the conditions of colonization of life world: the imperatives of autonomous subsystems, dropping ideological curtains, win, like the colonizers who came in primitive society, imposes to the life-world the outside assimilation process” [7, p. 521- 522].

Developing the ideas of functionalist theory of evolution, which describes society as a process of ever-increasing rationalization and differentiation, Habermas declares not only about separation and autonomy of social subsystems and processes for their integration (distinguishing between system and social integration), but also the penetration and expansion of political and economic mechanisms that followed by the logic of the system integration into the structures of the life-world. Therefore, the distinction between the two types of integration - social and system - within Habermas theoretical construct, becomes an instrument for diagnosis of modern society with attempts to making it a disappointing diagnosis. The result of the colonization of life world by system becomes, for example, monetization of certain areas of life where market agreement replacing specific forms of human relations (mutual assistance between family or friends degenerates into providing services for money). An example can also be complications and bureaucratization of social relations then life situation gets most accurate legal definition to regulate rights for social security. Thus, intervention based on power replaces everyday communication.

No less interesting appears using this distinction (of life-world and the system) in prognosis of possible lines of conflict that arise at the boundaries of the system and the life-world and are able to identify specific protest potential of modern societies. For example, activation of the environmental movement, whose members oppose the spread of technology that harms and destroys nature, actually represent a reaction of the life-world to autonomies expansion of the economic subsystem.

Habermas believes that he was able to develop appropriate criteria to assess the degree of rationality of processes of differentiation and autonomization in modern society and at the same time show the opportunities for resistance to this process. After all, if the system mechanisms are brassily interfere in the daily lives of people, the people will resist. In any case, despite some theoretical inconsistencies and discrepancies (which we did not specifically stop), the theory of Habermas, based on Parsons concepts of social order and social integration, not only offers a conceptual solution to the problem of integration in modern society, but it tries to help to make a diagnose and predict further developments.

The decision of theoretical problems - such as, for example, the development of theoretical synthesis and construction of a coherent theory of social action and social order, also define for modern theorists’ incentives to rethink traditional sociological concepts. Thus, the original duality of social and system integration, rethought in the context of synthetic theory of Giddens, and in a sense overcome. That, in turn, opens up new prospects for sociological theory and horizons to explore.

Thus in Giddens conception of structuration concept of social integration considered through the prism of rethinking the traditional dualism of modern

sociological theory of social and system integration. If the concept of social integration treated by Giddens in the traditional key - as a result of direct interaction between actors (in conditions of physical presence), the social integration, according to him occurs when the actors are forced to act in the conditions of distance from each other [8, p.501]. That is why space and time play a crucial role in distinction between social and system integration in Giddens theory. If for the study of processes of social integration sociology provides enough developed tools, for the study of system integration presented in this perspective, according to Giddens, is necessary to conduct a special historical research. This study involves the examination of how changing the opportunities and potential actions of individuals or groups over time, how technologies that enable people to combine their actions against the spatio-temporal distance with power resources are formed. Through a historical analysis, Giddens focuses on the invention of writing, which, according to him, was essential condition to integrate large numbers of people relying on power as state administration could function only through the preservation of information.

So Giddens moving away from the traditional dualism, typical of the functionalist theory of contrasting social and system integration, and attempts to examine the phenomenon of combining a large number of people in a situation of temporal and spatial distance. Abandoning the subjectless order theory offered by functionalist tradition in the context of the interpretation of system integration, Giddens theoretical sociology focuses on issues of social interaction that cannot lose sight of fluidity and changeability of social structures and the dialectic of domination and control, which provides permanent tense of negotiations process between the various actors interaction.

Conclusions. Therefore we tried to demonstrate different theoretical approaches developed by classics and modern authors, offers a variety of conceptual tools for describing and understanding the processes of integration in modern society. In fact, the same concept (integration - system and social) acquire within different theoretical constructs not only a different interpretation, but define different perspectives and offer opportunities for analysis and diagnosis of the processes taking place in society. Is it worth it to be afraid of such diversity? Rather, it should be remember, that every concept has a special plan of emanation horizon of events, in which it is given and interpreted. Only able reconstruction of this horizon will reveal the semantic capabilities and instrumental value of a concept. For this, it is necessary recourse to history, established traditions. As soon as communication, discourse and understanding existing conceptual diversity and experience may be formed theory of modern society.

References

1. Durkheim E. The Division of Labor in Society. - New York: Free Press, 1997
2. Parsons T. Essays in Sociological Theory. Revised Edition / T. Parsons. – N.Y-(London): Free Press, Macmillan, 1964.
3. Parsons T. Social system. – Glencoe: Free Press, 1951.

4. Parsons T. The System of Modern Societies. - Englewood Cliffs (N J) Prentice-Hall, 1971
5. Lockwood D. Social Integration and System integration / D. Lockwood // Exploration in social change / Ed. by G.Z. Zollschan, W. Hirsch. – L., 1964.
6. Habermas J. Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns. Bd. 1. Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung / J. Habermas. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1995.
7. Habermas J. Das Verhältnis zwischen System und Lebenswelt im Spätkapitalismus // J.Habermas. Theorie der Kommunikativen Handelns. 2. Bde. 3, durchges. Aufl. - Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1985, Bd. 2. - S.504–522.
8. Giddens A. The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration. - Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.